

**QUESTIONS AND REPONSES**

**NUMBERS 39-83**

39. Which version of Adobe Acrobat is required? The most current version is Adobe Acrobat 8.0, is that acceptable, or do you need a different version?

**Answer:** Adobe Acrobat 8.0 is acceptable but not required. As stated in RFP Section L.2, electronic media versions of proposal files are to be formatted in Adobe Acrobat 6.0 (PDF) or higher.

40. Section L of the RFP states that questions may be submitted within 30 calendar days of the release of the RFP. Will this timeframe be extended due the proposal due date extension?

**Answer:** Yes. The second sentence in Section L.30 will be amended as follows: All questions must be submitted not later than 30 calendar days prior to the proposal due date. This change will be included in a future amendment to the RFP.

41. In the RFP section L.5(f)(4)(B), DOE has provided costs for non-discriminating activities. DOE has stated the dollar value shall not be changed except to add the Offeror's indirect costs. Will DOE please provide a breakdown of these costs relating to labor and ODCs by year? We presume that Labor would be subject to fringe benefits, overhead and G&A, whereas ODCs would only be subject to G&A and/or a material handling fee. The breakdown of those costs between labor and ODCs will have a material impact on the application of indirect rates.

**Answer:** The costs relating to non-discriminating activities are inclusive of estimates for direct labor, fringe benefits, other direct costs (ODCs), indirect rates and overhead. The only changes to the costs are the inclusion of G&A and/or Corporate Home Office Allocation Rate. Section L.5 (f) (4) (B) will be Amended to read as follows: "The Offeror will not be allowed to change the assigned dollar figures with the exception to apply its proposed mark-up costs (e.g., G&A, Corporate Home Office Allocation Rate), if applicable, and to apply the base and award fee amounts.

42. For all PWS elements, what assumptions should Offerors utilize as the starting point for work? Should offerors assume that all work is on-schedule in accordance with the baseline?

**Answer:** For proposal preparation purposes, the Offeror should assume all work is on schedule in accordance with the requirements of the RFP in lieu of the Baseline which is a reference document. The PWS provides direction as to what work should be completed for each work element.

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

43. For PWS C.1.5.1, what is the starting point? The PWS states that the EE/CA has been submitted for approval. Work to be performed is “complete any remaining field work” and the final deliverable is due 2/28/2010 (5 months after start). How much work should offerors assume has been completed?

**Answer:** Any remaining field work which should be almost complete (e.g. punch list items, demobilization etc.) to support the 2/28/2010 Removal Action Completion Report. For proposal preparation purposes, the Offeror should assume all work is on schedule in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The PWS provides direction as to what work should be completed for each work element.

44. PWS C.1.4.2 states the removal action will be completed on 9/30/2009 (prior to start of this contract). The deliverable required is to submit the removal action completion report. How much work should offerors assume has been completed on the first day of this contract?

**Answer:** The Offeror should assume that 0% of the removal action completion report has been completed on the first day of this contract.

45. PWS C.1.4.3 states that submittal of the D1 Removal Action Work Plan is due on November 30, 2009 (2 months after award). How much work should offerors assume has been completed prior to the award date of this contract?

**Answer:** The Offeror should assume that 0% of the D1 version of the removal action work plan has been completed on the first day of this contract, but that a D0 version has been prepared and submitted to DOE.

46. PWS C.1.2(h)(3) states that “Contractor shall be designated as the waste generator...” We respectfully request a revision to the language that will allow the Offeror to sign manifests on behalf of DOE as follows: “When shipping and/or transporting DOE materials the shipping papers shall be executed by the CONTRACTOR on behalf of the DOE and shall have “On behalf of U. S. Department of Energy” on the signature line and “U. S. Department of Energy in care of the CONTRACTOR” in the shipper/generator’s name and mailing address section.”

**Answer:** The language will remain as written.

47. For PWS C.1.5.1, what are the current crew sizes?

**Answer:** Currently there are no crews in the field.

48. Will DOE provide access to the 2007 – 2008 PCB spill report of the actual PCB spills and activities for the last full two calendar years?

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

**Answer:** Summary tables for the 2007-2008 PCB spill reports have been posted on the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link under the PCB link.

49. Is all the Legacy waste gone? If not, has the remaining legacy waste been characterized, if yes, will DOE provide that characterization?

**Answer:** As of February 2009 all legacy waste has not been characterized or removed from the PGDP site. It is scheduled to be dispositioned by September 30, 2009.

50. For PWS 1.6, the RFP stipulates in Section C on page C-37, that the Offeror is to implement the ROD to support all waste disposal activities. Other sections of the RFP indicate that the on-site disposal cell will be available to accept up to 15% of the waste generated. The ROD is not completed, and no decision has been made about whether the on-site disposal cell will be the selected option, but at the same time offerors have to provide a cost estimate for the approach. Thus, for evaluation purposes, would DOE consider providing to all offerors the assumption of an on-site disposal cell as the option that is assumed for preparation of the cost estimate? This will prevent DOE evaluating approaches that are based on assumptions of the outcome of the ROD, when the ROD has not been completed. This common assumption will allow DOE to evaluate apples to apples in this area where an answer is not yet available and what offerors can do is only assume the outcome of the ROD.

**Answer:** The RFP does not state that the on-site disposal cell will be available to accept up to 15% of the waste generated. Section C.1.9 requires 15% completion of the remedial action field work. A decision of on-site vs. off-site has not been made, but for proposal preparation purposes only, it is acceptable to assume a disposal cell will be available for PGDP Federal Facilities Agreement derived waste.

51. Section C, Page C-31, PWS C.1.4.2, Work to Be Performed a) states that the work "Includes all applicable field work and analytical work necessary to support CERCLA documents." If the Removal Action for the three facilities, including field activities, will be completed by September 30, 2009, what then are the field activities expected of the Offeror?

**Answer:** Field activities may include disposal of wastes excavated or generated during this project, site restoration, and demobilization activities.

52. As the DOE TSCA Incinerator will no longer be available after Sept 2009, will DOE please provide treatment/disposal options and rates to be used in this proposal for radioactively contaminated PCB wastes that can not go into the Paducah on-site C-746-U landfill?

**Answer:** Offerors will need to investigate treatment options and rates. (Note that for proposal preparation purposes, Section C.1.7 is a non-discriminating activity and the costs is provided in Section L.5.)

**Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**  
**Paducah Remediation**

53. In terms of PWS C.1.3, what is the starting point in terms of the equipment and infrastructure removal in the C-410/420 complex? The Site Management Plan for 2008 appears to be at odds with the language in the RFP especially in light of the dates. Will DOE clarify the starting state of the equipment and infrastructure removal in the C-410/420 complex?

**Answer:** Per the RFP, Offerors should assume they will perform all activities to remove, decontaminate, decommission, demolish, and disposition all infrastructure components that contain asbestos or other hazardous materials and perform structural demolition of remaining structures down to the slab for sectors I through VIII in accordance with the approved Removal Action Work Plan for C-410.

54. Will DOE please clarify the deliverable date for the D&D reports, the Site Management Plan for 2008, indicates that it is one single report, whereas the RFP indicates that each removal action requires a separate report? In addition, the dates are in conflict, will DOE please clarify?

**Answer:** The Site Management Plan (SMP) for 2008 contains the only currently negotiated regulatory enforceable milestone deliverable for D&D. It should not be interpreted as a conflict with the RFP scope and deliverables. It is up to the Offeror to delineate the CERCLA documents (i.e. scope, content, and number of documents), beyond those currently approved, that will be necessary to support the D&D based on its proposed approach. It is expected that the Offeror's plan would support the RFP requirements as well as the one currently negotiated milestone in the SMP.

55. For PWS C.1.1.1, C-400 Source Remediation, will DOE please confirm the starting state for the C-400 remedial action?

**Answer:** Drilling for the first electrode borehole started on December 8, 2008.

56. C.1.8( j) (page C-42) requires the contractor to "monitor all SWMUs in accordance with the RCRA Permit." We are unable to find any reference in the Paducah RCRA Part B Permits that requires monitoring of all (over 500) SWMUs. Would DOE please specify an applicable reference in the RCRA Permit and clarify what work is referenced in this requirement?

**Answer:** The RCRA Permit requires notifications for any work to be conducted in a SWMU, which is what was meant by this sentence. No further reference will be provided.

57. C.1.8 (m) (page C-42) states: "Complete the C-746-U Groundwater Assessment Plan field investigation report and any required remedial actions in performance of the C-746-U Landfill Assessment." This seems to imply that conducting remedial action is a portion of the scope of work within the Environmental Monitoring and Reporting (C.1.8) section of the PWS. Would DOE confirm that this is correct, or should DOE

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

consider moving any required groundwater remedial actions to the Groundwater Environmental Actions (C.1.1) section of the PWS?

**Answer:** It is anticipated the Groundwater Assessment will be complete prior to implementation of the new contract. At this time, any required corrective actions are expected to be minor and will likely remain as a part of Environmental Monitoring and Reporting (C.1.8).

58. Part IV, Section L of the RFP provides DOE costs for Non-Discriminator Activities including Administration (C.1.10.4). Section C.1.10.10 notes that the "Contractor is responsible to provide only peripheral activities related to the telephone system for its own personnel." Is the contractor responsible for monthly telephone connection fees?

**Answer:** Initial and monthly connection fees are provided as a GFSI.

59. Section C.1.10.4 notes that the "Contractor shall provide administrative services including but not limited to....." Do these administrative services include Office machine rentals, expenses, and supplies?

**Answer:** Yes. The contractor is responsible for their administrative services to include office machine rentals, expenses, and supplies.

60. Section C.1.10.4 notes that the "Contractor shall provide administrative services including but not limited to....." Do these administrative services include accounting and auditing expenses?

**Answer:** Yes. The Contractor is responsible for its own accounting and auditing expenses, including when federal entities perform audits of the Contractor.

61. Section C.1.2.(c)(3) 1. If sale is selected, assist DOE in completing the sale and disposition of the classified nickel and other recyclable metals and materials. As allowed by applicable law, any proceeds generated from the sale of the classified nickel and other recyclable metals and materials will be utilized as directed by DOE to off-set and/or accelerate remediation of the Paducah Site.

Question. Can bidders assume that the off-set will reduce our proposed costs to conduct work at the Paducah site during the year in which we complete the sale and reduce our bid costs accordingly?

**Answer:** No. Offerors should not assume that any proceeds from the sale and disposition of the classified nickel and other recyclable metals and materials will be used to off-set and/or accelerate remediation of the Paducah Site.

62. Which version of Microsoft Office is acceptable to the Government? Do you require the documents to be in Microsoft Office 2003, or may we use 2007?

**Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**  
**Paducah Remediation**

Answer: Section L.5 states that Attachments L-7, L-8 and L-9, Cost Proposal Information and any spreadsheets or mathematical computation shall be submitted using Microsoft Excel 2000 or higher. It is DOE's preference that this information be submitted in Microsoft Office 2003.

63. Table C.1.1.1(a) (page C-7) specifies a milestone date of July 30, 2010 for the D1 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) for the C-400 source remediation. Table 5 (page 37) of the Remedial Action Work Plan (DOE/LX/07-0004&D2/R1, September 2008) specifies the RACR submittal date to be April 2011. In Schedule 04.11.01.05 C-400 on the EMCBC Paducah Remediation web site, Phase II remedial action field activities will not be completed until August 2010 and the RACR submittal date is specified to be June 28, 2011. Would DOE please clarify which is the correct C-400 source remediation D1 RACR submittal milestone? If the answer is to use the 7/30/2010 date specified in the RFP, how does DOE want offerors to resolve the apparent conflict of submitting a RACR before remedial action in the field has been completed?

**Answer:** The contract milestone date is July 30, 2010. There is no conflict. DOE expects the contractor to utilize their resources and sequence their activities to meet milestones and contractual obligations. Baseline dates and Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) dates have flexibility or float built into them. The baseline and FFA are separate agreements from the contract and they do NOT supersede the milestone dates in the contract. Regulatory milestone changes negotiated among DOE and regulators do NOT change or provide relief to contractual milestones. Any changes to contractual milestones will only be executed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

64. Table C.1.2(a) (page C-16) lists estimated quantities of wastes generated by the previous contractor.

- 1) Would DOE please provide the radiological characterization for the MTRU and TRU wastes?
- 2) Would DOE please provide the TRU waste physical form?
- 3) Would DOE please provide radiological characterization date for the TSCA MLLW?

**Answer:** 1) Current characterization data indicates total TRU concentrations ranging from 101 to 710 nCi/g for MTRU wastes and 237 to 639 nCi/g for TRU wastes.  
2) The current descriptions for the 21 MTRU containers are: Aqueous liquids - 10 containers; Solids w/liquids or sludges - 3 containers; Solids/debris - 6 containers; Solids/samples - 2 containers. The current descriptions for the 3 TRU containers are: Solid/residuals or samples - 2 containers; Solid/metal - 1 container.  
3) Generally this waste may contain radionuclides typically found at the PGDP (Tc-99, U-234, U238) at concentrations less than 1,000 pCi/g.  
(See the Paducah MTRU/TRU Containers table posted under the Reference Documents link under Material Disposition).

## Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020

### Paducah Remediation

65. Table C.1.2(b) (page C-16) lists estimated quantities of newly generated wastes to be generated. Would DOE please provide historical chemical and radiological characterization data that offerors can use to predict characteristics of future “runoff from waste facilities”?

**Answer:** The majority of this runoff has little to no detectable contaminants. Approximately 20 percent of the runoff has low levels of organic contaminants (PCBs, TCE) and radionuclides (uranium compounds and associated daughter products).

66. Q&A following the Paducah Remediation and Infrastructure Pre-Solicitation Conference, dated October 2, 2008, Question REM 17 (page 3 of 5): DOE has decided not to release the current contract baseline for the Paducah Remediation Project, yet requires all offerors to propose a fully priced and resource loaded schedule, equivalent to a baseline, for the new 5-year contract. The effort required to develop a baseline is expensive and time consuming. Would DOE please reconsider their decision and immediately release the current contract baseline so that all offerors may compete fairly.

**Answer:** The Paducah lifecycle baseline, approved January 2008, is available on the Paducah Remediation Project website. The Paducah lifecycle baseline includes the current contractor's period of performance. Offerors are not required to develop a fully priced proposal for non-discriminating activities in accordance with Section L.5. Note that regulatory milestone changes negotiated among DOE and regulators do NOT change or provide relief to contractual milestones. The same is true for baseline changes. Although DOE may agree to a baseline change, this change does NOT provide relief to contractual milestones. Any changes to contractual milestones will only be executed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

67. Section L.4(a) of the RFP requests a staffing plan reflecting the Offeror's proposed approach to the work, and a discussion of crew size, crew shifts, etc. In the cost proposal, Section L.5(f)(4)(B) provides costs for non-discriminating activities. Will DOE provide a staffing profile that reflects the non-discriminating costs by year or funding profile? Or provide a breakdown of labor included those costs? Offerors can not complete the staffing plan for the non-discriminating activities given that DOE has provided the total dollars but not a breakdown of the costs.

**Answer:** A staffing plan will not be required for non-discriminating activities. Section L.4 (a) will be Amended to read as follows: “The Offeror shall describe its yearly staffing plans including crew sizes, labor mix, and crew shifts to support the Offeror's planned approach to complete the PWS requirements for discriminating activities identified in Section L.5.(f).(4). (A).(i).”

68. L.4(a) (page L-12) requires a yearly staffing plan to support the offeror's planned approach to complete the PWS requirements. Should the yearly staffing plan include the manpower required for non-discriminating activities for which DOE provided costs in L.5(f)(4)(B) (page L-23)?

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

**Answer:** See the response to Question 67.

69. L.5 (f) (3) (page L-18) requires utilization of the current version of Primavera Systems Enterprise for construction software. H.1.1 (d) (page H-1) requires utilization of Primavera 6.0 (P6) scheduling software. Will DOE please confirm that Primavera 6.0 (P6) is the correct software to be used for the resource loaded schedule in the proposal?

**Answer:** Yes Primavera 6.0 (P6) is the correct software.

70. L.5(f)(4)(B) (page L-23) specifies 5-year DOE-provided costs for non-discriminating activities. Would DOE please provide the cost profile per year for each of the non-discriminating activities for use in responding to Volume II and Volume III staffing and costing requirements?

**Answer:** The Attachment L-7 "Summary of Cost Worksheets" provides the cost profile per year for non-discriminating activities. See the responses to Questions 41 and 67 with regard to staffing plan and costing requirements for non-discriminating activities.

71. The L-7 excel spread sheets roll all the contractor direct labor into one line item. However, the spread sheet requests direct labor by labor categories for subcontractors. Should direct labor by the contractor also be listed by labor categories?

**Answer:** Yes, the direct labor by the contractor should also be listed by labor categories consistent with Section L.5.(f).(4).(A).(iii) entitled "Cost Elements".

72. DOE has provided costs for Non-Discriminator Activities distributed in the L-7 excel spread sheets. DOE has provided these for activities 1.5 but does not provide them 1.5.1 and 1.5.2. Is the contract expected to distribute the costs from 1.5 into 1.5.1. and 1.5.2?

**Answer:** No, the costs should only be provided at the 1.5 level. Do not use Tabs 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 in the Attachment L-7 excel spread sheets.

73. Who will be responsible for the Security Plan identification of need, development, approval, implementation, and oversight?

**Answer:** The Remediation Contractor has the responsibility to recognize situations in which they will need to request or develop security plans to support their work, and to work with the Infrastructure Contractor/USEC as appropriate to get those plans in place. The Infrastructure Contractor is the Contractor Cognizant Security Authority (CSA) at the Paducah site and maintains the Site Security Plan for all DOE operations at the site. The CSA approves the physical security plans, and the Remediation Contractor will also be a signatory to the documents responsible for proper implementation and oversight of the work.



## Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020

### Paducah Remediation

74. The PWS states the quantities identified are based upon current estimates, and actual quantities may vary. Is it to be assumed that the contract proposal is to be based strictly on these quantities, and adjustments will be made to the cost and schedule, when actual quantities are determined?

**Answer:** For proposal preparation purposes the Offerors should use the estimated quantities in the PWS. The Contractor will be reimbursed for actual costs in accordance with the Allowable Cost and Payment clause in Section I during the term of the contract.

75. Does the current funding levels support the Milestone Schedules listed in the PWS?

**Answer:** Yes, the anticipated funding profile is expected to support the milestones/schedule in the PWS.

76. The Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration letter entitled, "REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2009 PRELIMINARY MIXED AND LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE (MLLW AND LLW) FORECASTS AND TRANSMITTAL OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION- NEVADA SITE OFFICE (NNSA/NSO) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR DISPOSAL OPERATIONS, JULY 2008" and dated July 15, 2008 states the following;

"It is not anticipated DOE sites will receive billing notices. However, for planning purposes, assume a disposal unit rate equivalent to \$14.51 per ft<sup>3</sup> for LLW and MLLW and that this cost will be borne by EM and other DOE programs.", and "Approval for receipt of out-of-state MLLW at the NTS was granted for a period not to exceed November 30, 2010, or until a maximum volume of 20,000 m<sup>3</sup> ( 706,293 ft<sup>3</sup> ) is reached, whichever occurs first - with closure of the MLLW cell to take place thereafter."

For the purposes of identifying the cost associated with the transportation and disposal of LLW and MLLW at the Nevada Test Site, what disposal unit rate should the Contractor assume?

Should the Contractor assume that Nevada Test Site will not receive out-of-state LLW and MLLW beyond November 30, 2010?

**Answer:** For proposal preparation purposes, the Offerors shall use a disposal unit rate of \$14.52/cft for any waste that meets the NTS waste acceptance criteria, and the Offeror plans to dispose of at NTS based on their technical approach. The Offerors shall assume the NTS facility will remain open through the duration of the contract for LLW. Per the referenced letter, NTS will not be taking MLLW after November 30, 2010.

77. Will DOE please clarify what costs we are to use for Option Item 002 and Option Item 003? RFP Section L.5(c) states "Proposed costs shall be provided based on the

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

definition of fiscal years noted in Table L.2.” Table L.2 shows that a total funding profile of \$4M for Option Item 002 and a total funding profile of \$14M for Option Item 003. RFP Section L.5(f)(4)(B), “Non-Discriminating Activities (DOE Provided Costs),” states “For proposal preparation purposes, the Offeror shall use the amounts shown below for proposed costs for all non-discriminating activities...” The amounts shown in this section include \$3.0M for Option item 002 and \$12.6M for Option Item 003.

**Answer:** Section L.5.(c) provides the anticipated funding profile for the contract, which includes the option items. The amounts for Option Item 002 and Option Item 003 shown in Section L.5.(f).(4).(B) are the estimated costs to which the Offeror will add proposed markup costs and fee in accordance with Section B.4 to come up with the total estimated cost and fee for the option items. Section M.5 provides the cost and fee evaluation criteria that DOE will use when comparing the evaluated price to the anticipated funding profile.

78. DOE has made select “In-Year” WBS Dictionaries available to all offerors. Please provide the “Out-Year” WBS Dictionaries that would cover the entire proposed contract period.

**Answer:** The additional WBS Dictionaries have been posted to the Paducah Lifecycle Baseline section of the procurement web page.

79. The recent Wage Determination posting on the Web page identifies the exempt personnel but nothing has been posted to date for the craft work force (United Steel Workers). The RFP in section H.8 page H-11 identifies two different craft wage determinations (J-6 Service Contract Act and J-7 Davis Bacon Act). Please clarify the intended use of the two separate craft wage determinations provide in the RFP.

**Answer:** The USW Collective Bargaining Agreement is posted as a reference document under the Workforce Breakdown and Pay and Benefits section of the procurement web page. The RFP contains both the Service Contract Act and Davis Bacon Act wage determinations because based on the nature (Services and/or Construction) of work being done under the contract.

80. L.3(a)(4) Indicates that a “list of subcontracts of the incumbent Contractor” will be posted at [www.emcbc.doe.gov/paducahremediation](http://www.emcbc.doe.gov/paducahremediation). When will DOE post this list?

**Answer:** The subcontracts are listed as reference documents under the Subcontracts section of the procurement web page.

81. Please verify the date for the start of ERH operations and the milestone for completion of the RA report.

**Answer:** Operation of the ERH system is expected to begin in calendar year 2009. The D1 Remedial Action Completion Report milestone date is 7/30/10.

## **Solicitation DE-RP30-09CC40020**

### **Paducah Remediation**

82. The L-7 excel spread sheets provides only for input of the total costs per year. Can the contractor modify the spread sheet to include total labor hours, labor rates, and total costs by year?

**Answer:** Yes, Offerors may modify the spreadsheet to include total labor hours and labor rates. Specifically, direct labor by contractor should also be listed by labor categories and associated labor rates consistent with Section L.5.(f).(4).(A).(iii) entitled "Cost Elements".

83. Section L of the RFP states that the Offeror shall require that clients return Past Performance Questionnaires directly to the address identified on Attachment L-5 no later than five (5) weeks after issuance of the solicitation. Will this timeframe be extended due the proposal due date extension?

**Answer:** Yes. The second sentence of Section L.4(d)(4) will be amended as follows: "The Offeror shall require that the clients return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to the address identified on Attachment L-5 no later than six (6) weeks after issuance of this solicitation."